1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10	JIMI JAMES HAMILTON,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C13-5422 RJB-JRC
12	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF
13	SCOTT FRAKES,	COUNSEL
14	Defendant.	
15	The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. §1983 civil rights action to the undersigned	
16	Magistrate Judge. The Court's authority for the referral is 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and	
17	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4.	
18	Plaintiff asks the Court to appoint counsel to represent him in this matter (ECF No. 8).	
19 20	Plaintiff supports his motion with nothing more than conclusory statements that set forth some of	
20	the factors the Court considers when deciding if appointment of counsel is warranted (id). The	
22	Court denies the motion.	
23	There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Although the Court can request counsel to represent a party, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), the Court may	
24	Although the Court can request counsel to repre	sent a party, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), the Court may

do so only in exceptional circumstances. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984); Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires the Court to evaluate both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331. This case is just starting and the Court cannot properly evaluate plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits. Plaintiff has articulated his claims quite well. Plaintiff alleges that his eighth amendment rights have been violated because he has been placed in an intensive management unit. Plaintiff alleges that he is mentally ill and the conditions of confinement in an intensive management unit exacerbate his condition. Plaintiff fails to show that appointment of counsel is warranted and the alleged "hardships" in accessing legal materials have repeatedly been found constitutional. See, Keenan v. Hall, 83 F.3d 1083, 1093-4 (9th Cir. 1996); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332 1335 (9th Cir. 1990). The Court denies plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. Dated this 11th day of July, 2013. J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24